



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/879,743	06/11/2001	David P. Maher	7451.0036-00	5125
22852	7590	08/22/2006	EXAMINER	
FINNEGAN, HENDERSON, FARABOW, GARRETT & DUNNER LLP 901 NEW YORK AVENUE, NW WASHINGTON, DC 20001-4413			PICH, PONNOREAY	
			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
			2135	

DATE MAILED: 08/22/2006

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)	
	09/879,743	MAHER ET AL.	
	Examiner	Art Unit	
	Ponnoreay Pich	2135	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 08 June 2006.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-20 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-14 and 16-20 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☒ Claim(s) 15 is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☐ The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

A request for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, including the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e), was filed in this application after final rejection. Since this application is eligible for continued examination under 37 CFR 1.114, and the fee set forth in 37 CFR 1.17(e) has been timely paid, the finality of the previous Office action has been withdrawn pursuant to 37 CFR 1.114. Applicant's submission filed on 6/8/2006 has been entered.

Claims 1-20 are pending. Applicant's amendments and arguments have been fully considered, but are moot in view of new rejections presented below. It is noted that applicant's arguments are directed towards limitations newly added via amendments. Any well known art statements from the last office action not argued by applicant are taken as admittance of prior art as per MPEP 2144.03.

Claim Objections

Claim 1 is objected to because of the following informalities: On line 17 of claim 1, "examin" should be "examine". Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

Art Unit: 2135

Claims 19-20 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention.

1. Claim 19 recites "the electronic rule". The examiner believes applicant meant "the at least one electronic rule".
2. Claim 20 is rejected due to dependency.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Claims 1-2 and 16-17 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over England et al (US 6,820,063) in view of Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) and further in view of Tycksen, Jr. et al (US 6,189,097).

Claim 1:

England discloses:

1. Executing an application program on the user's computing device, the application program being capable of rendering electronic content, the application program having at least a first digital certificate associated therewith (Fig 2, item 209; Fig 3, step 311; col 9, lines 1-14; and col 18, lines 18-22).

2. The piece of electronic content having at least a second digital certificate associated therewith, and the piece of electronic content further having associated therewith at least one electronic rule, the at least one electronic rule including data specifying one or more conditions associated with rendering the piece of electronic content, the one or more conditions including a condition that the piece of electronic content may be rendered by an application program having the first digital certificate associated therewith (Fig 2, items 221-223; col 18, lines 23-65).
3. Using a rights management program running on the user's computing device to examine the data included in the at least one electronic rule and to determine that the piece of electronic content may be rendered by an application program having the first digital certificate associated therewith (col 10, lines 26-36).
4. Verifying the association of the first digital certificate with the application program using the rights management program (col 10, lines 26-36).
5. Rendering the piece of electronic content using the application program (col 10, lines 31-36)

England does not explicitly disclose requesting the application program to render a piece of electronic content. England does not explicitly disclose verifying the association of the second digital certificate with the piece of electronic content. However, one skilled should appreciate that in a computing environment, in order to render a piece of electronic content by an application program, one must request that

Art Unit: 2135

the application program render the piece of electronic content. Further, Peinado discloses requesting the application program to render a piece of electronic content (col 13, lines 61-66). Peinado also does not disclose verifying the association of the second digital certificate with the piece of electronic content. However, Tycksen discloses the limitation (col 7, lines 9-27).

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to incorporate Peinado and Tycksen's teaching within England's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 1. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate Peinado's teachings because it is standard practice in the art wherein if one wanted to render a piece of electronic content, a request is made to the application program which performs the rendering. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate Tycksen's teachings because verifying the association of the second digital certificate with the piece of electronic content would prove authenticity of the electronic content and protect against corruption of the electronic content (Tycksen: col 3, lines 28-34). Note that as further disclosed by Tycksen, corruption of electronic content could be indication of a virus (col 2, lines 7-15), thus protecting against corruption would protect England's system from viruses.

Claim 2:

England does not explicitly disclose the first digital certificate is generated by a first entity, and the second digital certificate is generated by a second entity different from the first entity. However, the limitation was well known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made. Further, Peinado discloses a first digital certificate is

Art Unit: 2135

generated by a first entity (col 13, lines 7-13 and col 18, lines 56-67). The DRM updates the black box which contains the first digital certificate, thus generating the first digital certificate. Peinado further discloses a second digital certificate is generated by a second entity different from the first entity (col 20, lines 63-66). The license server is the second entity. At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify England's invention such that the first and second digital certificates were generated by a first entity and a second entity different from the first entity. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would avoid placing too much responsibility or trust in one entity to generate certificates, which would make the electronic content more secure against unauthorized usage.

Claim 16:

As per the limitation recited in claim 16, the examiner submits that it is well known and common practice in the art that when executing a program, to first verify that the user has a license to use the program before allowing the user to use the program for any purpose. Because of this, in England's modified invention, the verification of the association of the second digital certificate with the piece of electronic content must be performed after the step of verifying the association of the first digital certificate with the application program. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to verify the association of the second digital certificate after verifying the association of the first digital certificate because it is standard practice in the art to verify that a user can use the application before allowing the user to actually use the application for any purpose, i.e. such as rendering an electronic content.

Art Unit: 2135

Claim 17:

England does not explicitly disclose wherein the step of verifying the association of the first digital certificate with the application program includes computing a hash of at least part of the application program, and comparing the hash to a value contained in the digital certificate. However, hash algorithms were well known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made as they are disclosed by Peinado (col 31, lines 5-20). Hashes are used for verification purposes, therefore it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to further modify England's invention such that the verification of the association of the first digital certificate with the application program includes computing a hash of at least part of the application program and comparing the hash to a value contained in the digital certificate. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so because use of hashing would allow one to verify that the application wanting to render an application is the same one that originally requested the DRM to run. This would help prevent unauthorized use of digital content.

Claim 3 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over England et al (US 6,820,063) in view of Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) and Tycksen, Jr. et al (US 6,189,097) and further in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" hereafter referred to as "SDMI".

Art Unit: 2135

Claim 3:

England does not explicitly disclose the first entity comprises an association of one or more content providers, and the first digital certificate is associated with the application program if the application program meets certain predefined criteria set by the association.

However, the Secure Digital Music Initiative is an association known at the time the applicant's invention was made. The members of the association consist of about 200 companies who are electronic content providers. SDMI discloses that an application is SDMI-Compliant if it conforms to the requirements set forth in the specification published by the members of the Secure Digital Music Initiative (p6, definition 3.5). The Secure Digital Music Initiative and its specification shows that content providers are interested in security control of their content to the extent of even specifying what set of criteria an application must meet before being allowed legally access/render the content. They also show that it was possible at the time the applicant's invention was made to do provide such control.

In light of the above, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention was made to further modify England's invention according to the limitation recited in claim 3 in light of SDMI's teachings. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so because it would allow content providers to have better security and control over their contents.

Claims 4-5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over England et al (US 6,820,063) in view of Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) and Tycksen, Jr. et al (US 6,189,097) and further in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" hereafter referred to as "SDMI" and Sullivan et al (US 6,662,365).

Claim 4:

England does not specifically disclose the second entity comprises an entity concerned with controlling the nature of the electronic content that is rendered by the application program, and the second digital certificate is associated with the piece of electronic content if the piece of electronic content meets certain predefined standards. However, Sullivan discloses that at the time the applicant's invention was made, there existed an entity concerned with controlling the nature of electronic content, i.e. parents or the MPAA (col 1, lines 16-18). Sullivan further discloses that it was well known that television programs use MPAA ratings if the program meets certain criteria such as violence being found in the program (col 1, lines 33-44).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to further modify England's invention in light of Sullivan's teachings according to the limitations recited in claim 4. One of ordinary skills would have been motivated to do so as it would allow for the piece of electronic content to be rated and for parents to control if their children were allowed to access the content or not based on the ratings.

Claim 5:

The limitation of the second entity comprises a private or governmental entity that determines whether content is appropriate for minors, and the second digital certificate indicates that the piece of electronic content is deemed appropriate for minors is obvious to England's modified invention as England discloses the MPAA, i.e. a private entity which determines whether content is appropriate for minors, specifies rights for the second digital certificate (col 18, line 63-col 19, line 7).

Claims 6-8 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over England et al (US 6,820,063) in view of Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) further in view of Tycksen, Jr. et al (US 6,189,097) and further in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" hereafter referred to as "SDMI" and further in view of Lion (US 6,330,491).

Claim 6:

England does not specifically disclose the piece of electronic content comprises a prescription, and in which the first entity associates the first digital certificate with the application program if it is determined that the application program will handle the prescription with at least a predefined level of security. However, Lion discloses the piece of electronic content comprises a prescription, i.e. Rx (col 3, lines 53-64). Further, Lion discloses an Rx vending machine (RVM) which requires that a user be

Art Unit: 2135

authenticated before it can be used (col 4, lines 41-54). Lion also discloses that only RVM's associated with the network can be used to fill prescriptions (col 6, lines 10-13).

In light of how dangerous some prescription medications are, it is especially important that the application program which reads digital prescriptions and dispenses the medication have some predetermined level of security so that some first entity could reasonably entrust it to fill prescriptions safely. It is also important that the identity of everyone involved in filling the prescription be verified for safety reasons from the physician issuing the prescription, the pharmacist who fills the prescription, to the user/patient who gets the prescription. Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to incorporate the teachings of England's modified invention within the environment disclosed by Lion to arrive at the invention as recited in claim 6. One of ordinary skills would have been motivated to do so as it would allow for electronic prescriptions to be written and filled in a secure manner due to concern for medical safety.

Claim 7:

Lion further discloses the predefined level of security includes a requirement that the application verify that an application user has a predefined certificate before rendering the prescription (col 3, lines 53-64 and col 5, lines 47-52).

Claim 8:

Lion further discloses the predefined certificate indicates that the application user is a licensed pharmacist (col 5, lines 47-52).

Claim 9 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over England et al (US 6,820,063) in view of Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) further in view of Tycksen, Jr. et al (US 6,189,097) and further in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" hereafter referred to as "SDMI" and further in view of Lion (US 6,330,491) and further in view of Hsu et al (US 5,982,898).

Claim 9:

England does not specifically disclose a certified pharmacist is identified by digital certificate issued by a third entity different from the first and second entity. However, Lion discloses a certified pharmacist is identified by a digital certificate (col 5, lines 47-52). Lion also does not explicitly disclose wherein said digital certificate is issued by a third entity different from the first and second entity. However, independent or third party entities which verify a user's identity and issues certificates which authenticates the user to other parties were well known at the time the applicant's invention was made as disclosed by Hsu (col 1, lines 32-51).

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time applicant's invention was made to further modify England's invention according to the limitations of claim 9 in light of Lion and Hsu's teachings. One of ordinary skills would have been motivated to do so as it would have resulted in better security and more reliability that a user (i.e. the physician, pharmacist, patient, or some other user) is who they claim to be.

Claims 10-14 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over England et al (US 6,820,063) in view of Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) and Tycksen, Jr. et al (US 6,189,097) further in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" hereafter referred to as "SDMI" and further in view of Sullivan et al (US 6,662,365), Lion (US 6,330,491), and Hsu et al (US 5,982,898)

Claim 10:

England does not disclose the second entity associates the second digital certificate with the prescription if the prescription originated from a certified physician. However, Lion discloses a pharmacist verifying the validity of an electronic prescription request by contacting the prescribing physician, i.e. certified physician (col 5, lines 26-29). This shows that having to verify the physician's identity listed on the electronic prescription was a known concern at the time the applicant's invention was made. Further, as mentioned in claim 9, Hsu discloses that one known way of verifying a party's identity with a reasonable degree of confidence is with a certificate issued by an independent party, i.e. the second entity (col 1, lines 32-51). These teachings read on the limitation recited in claim 10.

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the applicant's invention was made to further modify England's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 10 in light of Lion and Hsu's teachings. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so for the same reasons given in claims 6 and 9. One of ordinary skills would have further been motivated to do so because having a second entity associate a

Art Unit: 2135

second digital certificate with the prescription if the prescription originated from a certified physician gives further confidence that the prescription was checked for validity.

Claim 11:

England does not disclose a certified physician is identified by a third digital certificate issued by a third party entity different from the first and second entities. However, Lion discloses having to verify a physician's identity (col 5, lines 26-29). Further, Hsu discloses that one known way of verifying a party's identity with a reasonable degree of confidence is with some sort of certificate issued by an independent party (col 1, lines 32-51).

Therefore, it would have been obvious at the time the applicant's invention was made to further modify England's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 11 in light of Lion and Hsu's teachings. One of ordinary skills would have been motivated to do so for the same reasons given in claim 6.

Claim 12:

England does not explicitly disclose the second entity determines that a prescription originates from a certified physician by checking for the presence of the third digital certificate issued by the third entity. However, checking that for the presence of a certificate issued by a third party entity for validation was well known in the art at the time applicant's invention was made. It would have been obvious to further modify England's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 12. One

skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would prevent distribution of prescription medication to unauthorized individuals.

Claim 13:

England does not explicitly disclose the application program is further associated with a fourth digital certificate, the fourth digital certificate attesting to a determination having been made by a fourth entity that the application program possesses a predefined functionality. However, Hsu discloses that verification by an independent party was well known at the time the applicant's invention was made (col 1, lines 32-51). Further, as mentioned previously in claim 3, SDMI teaches that content providers are interested in controlling their electronic content and would want to verify that an application accessing their electronic content meets certain criteria.

Therefore, it would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the applicant's invention was made to further modify England's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 13 in light of Hsu and SDMI's teachings. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so because it would allow for assurance to the electronic content provider that the application accessing their electronic content meets certain criteria.

Claim 14:

England does not explicitly disclose the predefined functionality includes functionality that ensures that the application program verifies the association of the second digital certificate with the piece of electronic content before rendering the piece of electronic content. However, Tycksen discloses a piece of electronic content could

Art Unit: 2135

be corrupted by a virus (col 2, lines 7-15) and that use of a digital certificate, i.e. verifying the association of the second digital certificate with the piece of electronic content, could prevent use of a corrupted/infected piece of electronic content (col 3, lines 28-35). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one skilled in the art to further modify England's invention according to the limitations recited in claim 14. One skilled would have been motivated to do so because it would ensure the user's computer is not damaged by a virus infected electronic content.

Claim 18 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over England et al (US 6,820,063) in view of Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) and Tycksen, Jr. et al (US 6,189,097) and further in view of Hall et al (US 5,920,861).

Claim 18:

England does not explicitly disclose decrypting a secure container containing a piece of electronic content and the electronic rule and retrieving the electronic rule from the secure container.

However, Hall discloses a secure container containing a piece of electronic content and the electronic rule (col 1, lines 34-65). At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use Hall's teachings to contain a piece of electronic content and electronic rule in a secure container. One of ordinary skill would have been motivated to do so because Hall

discloses that the secure container allow digital content to be safely and securely stored and transported (col 1, lines 34-36).

Hall does not explicitly disclose decrypting the secure container and retrieving the electronic rule from the secure container. However, the examiner submits that encryption of content was a well known method of securing digital content and to retrieve the content, one must decrypt the encrypted content. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to decrypt the secure container because it would allow for retrieval of the secured content for use. It would have been further obvious to one of ordinary skill to retrieve the electronic rule from the secure container because one needs to know what usage rules to apply to the content in the container in England's modified invention. One skilled should appreciate that in England's modified invention since the second digital certificate which contains the usage rules can be examined, the electronic rules must have been retrieved from the secure container.

Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) in view of England et al (US 6,820,063).

Claim 19:

Peinado discloses:

1. Receiving, at a rights management program running on the user's computing device, a request from an application program running on the user's computing device to render a piece of electronic content (col 2, lines 53-56 and col 13, line 13-col 14, line 42), the piece of electronic content having at least one electronic

Art Unit: 2135

rule associated therewith, the at least one electronic rule including data specifying one or more conditions associated with rendering the electronic content, the one or more conditions including a condition that the piece of electronic content may be rendered by an application program having a predefined digital certificate associated therewith (col 15, lines 3-29 and col 17, line 32-col 18, line 4), the predefined digital certificate attesting to the application program's possession of one or more characteristics (col 18, line 56-col 19, line 16).

2. Rendering the piece of electronic content using the application program (Fig 5A-5B).

Peinado does not disclose the following limitations, which are disclosed by England:

1. Using the rights management program to examiner the data included in the at least one electronic rule and to verify the association of the predefined digital certificate with the application program in accordance with the at least one electronic rules (England: col 10, lines 26-36 and col 18, lines 18-62).
2. Rendering the piece of electronic content using the application program **upon successful verification of the association of the predefined digital certificate with the application program** (England: col 10, lines 26-36).

At the time applicant's invention was made, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to combine Peinado and England's teachings according to the limitations recited in claim 19. One skilled would have been motivated to incorporate England's teachings with Peinado because Peinado is interested in digital rights management while England's teachings would allow an easy comparison between the properties of an entity wishing access to content and those required by the content provider (England: col 4, lines 19-22).

Claim 20 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over Peinado et al (US 6,775,655) in view of England et al (US 6,820,063) and further in view of "SDMI Portable Device Specification, Part 1, Version 1.0" hereafter referred to as "SDMI".

Claim 20:

Peinado does explicitly disclose the predefined digital certificate indicates that the application program checks output drivers for integrity. However, SMDI discloses that an application is SDMI-Compliant if it conforms to the requirements set forth in the specification published by the members of the Secure Digital Music Initiative (p6, definition 3.5). The Secure Digital Music Initiative and its specification shows that content providers are interested in security control of their content to the extent of even specifying what set of criteria an application must meet before being allowed legally access/render the content. They also show that it was possible at the time the applicant's invention was made to do provide such control.

In light of SDMI's teachings, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill to further modify Peinado's invention such that the predefined digital certificate indicates that the application program checks output drivers for integrity because it would indicate that the application program is SDMI compliant in that it checks for a valid credential or signature associated with the digital content before rendering it.

Allowable Subject Matter

Claim 15 is objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Ponnoreay Pich whose telephone number is 571-272-7962. The examiner can normally be reached on 9:00am-4:30pm Mon-Fri.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kim Vu can be reached on 571-272-3859. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Art Unit: 2135

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

PP

Ponnoreay Pich
Examiner
Art Unit 2135



KIM VU
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2100